MNDSPD.0005P **PATENT** IN THE UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE Group Art Unit: 2857 pplicant Jones, et al. ) 09/810,932 Appl. No. I hereby certify that this correspondence and all marked attachments are being deposited with the United States Filed March 16, 2001 Postal Service as first-class mail in an envelope addressed to: Mail Stop Amendment, Commissioner for Patents, P.O. Box 1450 Alexandria, VA 22313-1450, on For **METHOD AND APPARATUS** FOR TRANSMISSION LINE **ANALYSIS** Examiner Jeffrey R. West

## TRANSMITTAL

Mail Stop Amendment Commissioner for Patents P.O. Box 1450 Alexandria, VA 22313-1450

Dear Sir:

Transmitted herewith with respect to the above-identified application are:

- (X) A Response to Office Action After Re-Opening of Appeal in 19 pages;
- (X) Return postage prepaid postcard.
- (X) The Commissioner is hereby authorized to charge any additional fees which may be required, or credit any overpayment to Account No.: 502200. A duplicate copy of this sheet is enclosed.

Appl. No.

09/810,932

Filed

: March 16, 2001

Dated:

By:

Chad W. Miller

Attorney of Record

Registration No. 44,943

Respectfully submitted,

Weide & Miller, Ltd.

Bank West Building, 5th Floor

7251 West Lake Mead Blvd., Suite 530

Las Vegas, NV 89128

(702) 382-4804 (Pacific Time)



AF/ 2857 IIW

**PATENT** 

## IN THE UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

Applicant	:	Jones, et al.	) Group Art Unit: 2857
Appl. No.	:	09/810,932	) I hereby certify that this correspondence and
Filed	:	March 16, 2001	all marked attachments are being deposited with the United States Postal Service as first class mail in an envelope addressed to: Commissioner for Patents, P. O. Box 1450, Alexandria, VA 22313-1450, on
For	:	METHOD AND APPARATUS FOR TRANSMISSION LINE ANALYSIS	November 10, 2004  (Date)
Examiner	:	Jeffrey R. West	Chad W. Miller, Reg. No. 44,943

## RESPONSE UNDER 37 C.F.R. 1.111 TO FIRST OFFICE ACTION AFTER RE-OPENING OF PROSECUTION AFTER APPEAL

This is in Response to the Action mailed August 11, 2004 in which the Examiner opted to re-open prosecution after appeal. In the Action, the Examiner asserted the same rejections as had been set forth by the Examiner before. The Examiner also objected to Claims 6 and 30 as being allowable if re-written to incorporate the limitations of the base claims and any intervening claims. In response, the Applicants requests that the Examiner amend the application as indicated below.